



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,948	08/17/2000	Ned Hoffman	STA-25	4850
60460	7590	06/09/2009	EXAMINER	
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - You Technologies 210 SW MORRISON STREET SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204			ZELASKIEWICZ, CHRYSTINA E	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3621		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		06/09/2009		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/639,948	Applicant(s) HOFFMAN, NED
	Examiner CHRYSTINA ZELASKIEWICZ	Art Unit 3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16, 18-24, 26-48, 50-56 and 58-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-16, 18-24, 26-48, 50-56, 58-69 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/901/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Intent to File a Patent Application
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - a. Invention I: Claims 1-16, 18-24, 26-31, 64, 66, and 69, drawn to secure transaction, classified in class 705, subclass 64.
 - b. Invention II: Claims 32-48, 50-56, 58-63, 65, and 67-68, drawn to business processing using cryptography, classified in class 705, subclass 50.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Inventions I and II are directed to related distinct processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a materially different mode of operation. Specifically, Invention I requires a user preference designation step, where a user designates a preference during a registration period. This preference designation step and registration period are absent from Invention II. Instead, Invention II requires processing of an electronic consumer loyalty or rewards incentive, which is absent from Invention I. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
4. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
 - c. the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
 - d. the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

- e. the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
 - f. the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
 - g. the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. §101 and/or 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.
5. **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 C.F.R. §1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**
6. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.144. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.
7. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.
8. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of the other invention.
9. A telephone call was made to Ariel Rogson on June 3, 2009, but no answer was received.
10. Examiner notes that in light of Applicant's amendments filed March 23, 2009, claims 1, 32, and 68 are now patentably distinct. Prior to March 23, 2009 amendment, the claims were not patentably distinct.

Because Applicant's amendment for the first time sets forth patenably distinct claims, a restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121 is now required.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Chrystina Zelaskiewicz whose telephone number is 571.270.3940. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached at 571.272.6779.
12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>](http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair). Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866.217.9197 (toll-free).

/Chrystina Zelaskiewicz/
Examiner, Art Unit 3621
June 3, 2009

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621